

[REDACTED]

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



[REDACTED] email below from the applicant regarding the change to the **justification** for the proposed alternative access onto Tye Lane set out in planning application **WA/63/21/PL**.

Thanks,

Michael

From: John Longhorn [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2021 11:23
To: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: Alternative Access Tye Lane Walburton WA/63/21/PL

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Michael

Further to our earlier conversation it was disappointing to hear that ADC are looking to issue a refusal based on a lack of further drainage and tree information in respect to Tye Lane. I did mention that it will take a little time to get further drainage comments, however, these are set out below. Given that it's a Tuesday then perhaps these can be

evaluated today. Also attached is the approach that we would take from an arboricultural point of view as provided by CSA

Ardent said in relation to Lauras comments :

- *Comment 1 (Culvert invert level vs the foul pipe invert level):* As the foul pipe is part of the proposed works we have the ability to lower the foul pipe invert to provide greater clearance to the culvert. Given the downstream connection invert, we would be able to lower the proposed foul pipe by over one metre.
- *Comment 2 (Ability to deepen the watercourse given the constraints that exist):* Pending further investigation to determine the presence of tree roots, the supplied drawing demonstrates that from a levels perspective, the proposed culvert and ditch realignment can be achieved.
- *Comment 3a (The proposed cross-sections are narrower than existing, leading to a loss of capacity):* The proposed ditch bed width is 0.5m, this is only 88mm narrower than the existing bed width at the upstream end of the proposed works. Any loss of capacity is more than compensated for by the proposed deepening of the ditch and the resulting increase in cross-sectional area. This is evident in the table below which compares the existing and proposed cross-sectional areas in all three sections shown on drawing 183248-001:

Cross-section (ref. drawing 183248-001)	Existing Cross-sectional Area (m2)	Proposed Cross-sectional Area (m2)	Proposed % Increase in Cross-sectional Area
A-A	0.93	1.17	25.8%
B-B	1.25	1.85	48.0%
C-C	0.91	1.06	16.4%

Notwithstanding the above, it is worth highlighting that this ditch is not expected to convey a significant volume of water – it starts circa 130m north of the proposed access, does not receive any flow from Tye Lane (the bank top is consistently higher than the channel of Tye Lane), the land to the north and east does not drain to the ditch (the topographic survey demonstrates that ground levels fall consistently to the south, not towards the ditch), and finally, there is no observable outfall to the southern end of the ditch. The ditch is therefore isolated.

- *Comment 3b (Steep side slopes will lead to erosion and collapse):* The long term stability of the ditch will be considered during detailed design. If necessary for erosion protection, we would opt to use a proprietary slope stabilisation product which allows vegetation growth. One such solution is EnkaMat which has been used with great success on previous projects and promotes strong vegetation growth for permanent erosion protection.
- *Comment 3c (Works within the tree root protection areas):* [Insert advice from CSA]. If the further investigative works reveal the presence of significant tree roots within the area of the realigned ditch, we would recommend a lengthening of the culvert to avoid damage to the tree roots. This option would entail significantly less excavation.

CSA said:

- In respect of the ditch excavations works and the close presence of the TPO trees, we would recommend that exploratory air spade works are carried-out along the length of the ditch, under the supervision of the appointed arboriculturalist, particularly to the south of the proposed access to establish if any major roots are present within the extent of the proposed excavation.
- Once air spade exploratory works are complete, the extent of potential impacts can be thoroughly evaluated and any amends to the ditch proposals made accordingly or where root pruning is the only viable option, an approach agreed in partnership with the LPA tree officer and set-out in a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement.
- Once the final scheme is agreed, works to form the new ditch should continue to be undertaken through a combination of both air-spade works and hand-digging, all of which should be undertaken under the supervision of the appointed arboriculturalist.

As we have an extension of time until the 24th September this should be sufficient to resolve the above matters. If ADC drainage need further time or indeed further information then we can look at an extension of time.

Turning to the WSCC Highways comments. In their response WSCC stated that they required clarity in respect to para 4.2 of the Planning Statement. This was given and the applicants position is that because absolute certainty is required, then if consented, the proposal would be implemented during the course of construction of the 175 units which will be within the 5 year lifetime of the consent. Therefore, having discussed the WSCC Highways response of the 19th August last further with them, we would respond as follows:

1. Following further discussions with NH (National Highways – no longer Highways England (HE)) there was no requirement for a ban on U-turn movements at the A27/Yapton Lane junction, which is why this was not picked up in our proposals. The proposed improvements to A27 have been reviewed by NH and covered in a Stage 1 RSA, which has been accepted by NH.
2. The planning statement mentions that the application would not be implemented until the Arundel Bypass (Grey Route) was implemented. However, this is no longer the case, and the application is proposed to be implemented as soon as possible, disregarding the future status of the Arundel Bypass.

As a result I would be grateful if you would pass these comments onto WSCC Highways for them to comment on. Again their response should be relatively swift and well within the extension granted until the 24th September.

In the circumstances we would request that this further information be disseminated for further comment and I will give you a call once you are in receipt of this email to confirm

Kind Regards

John Longhorn
Planning Manager



Part of the Vistry Group

This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments you must not copy, distribute, disclose or use them for any purpose. If you have received this email in error, please notify [REDACTED] and delete all copies from your system. Email communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or free from error or viruses. Vistry Group accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by viruses. Opinions, conclusions and other information within this email unrelated to the business of Vistry Group are the responsibility of the individual sender. Vistry Group PLC is registered in England and Wales with registered number 306718. The registered office is 11 Tower View, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent, ME19 4UY. You can view a copy of our privacy policy: <https://www.vistrygroup.co.uk/site-services/privacy/>.